

1. Reference is made to the following documents:

D1: PREHOFER C ET AL: "Synchronized reconfiguration of a group of mobile nodes in ad-hoc networks", 23 February 2003, pages 400-405

D2: BEACH M ET AL: "THE EUROPEAN PROJECT TRUST - RECONFIGURABLE TERMINALS AND SUPPORTING NETWORKS LE PROJECT EUROPEEN TRUST - TERMINAUX RECONFIGURABLES ET RESEAUX DE SUPPORT" ANNALES of the TELECOMMUNICATIONS - ANNALS OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS, PRESSES POLYTECHNIQUES ET UNIVERSITAIRES ROMANDES, LAUSANNE, CH, Vol. 57, No. 7/8, July 002 (2002-07), pages 653-676

2. **Re. Point V**

Reasoned statement with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such a statement

2.1 Document **D1** discloses (see especially page 400, right-hand column, line 7 to 21; page 401, left-hand column, line 7 to 18; page 401, right-hand column, point 7.b) in conformity with **all** features of **claim 1**, a radio system (see page 400, left-hand column Figure 1, "Ad-hoc network") with at least one radiocommunication device, which features:

a reconfigurable radio interface (see page 400, right-hand column, line 19 to 21, "Change of radio layer..."),

a first memory, in which normal operation configuration information is stored (see page 400, right-hand column, line 19 to 21, "Change of radio layer..."; it is noted that in **D1** the radiocommunication device in the course of an "update" receives new configuration data which must be stored as normal operation configuration information),

a second memory, in which error configuration

information is stored (see page 401, left-hand column, lines 17 to 18, "organized fallback to the old configuration"; it is noted that in D1 the radiocommunication device stores the old configuration data and calls it up in the event of an error),

a control unit for configuring the reconfigurable radio interface,

an error detection device which is set up to detect an error of the reconfigurable radio interface (see page 401, right-hand column, point 7.b) and

an error treatment device which is set up, using the error configuration information, to provide error treatment such that the reconfigurable radio interface will be reconfigured (see page 401, right-hand column, point 7.b; it is noted that in accordance with D1 the error treatment provides for a fallback to the old configuration (i.e. the error configuration); in this case this error configuration is used to automatically reconfigure the radio interface of the radiocommunication device; it should further be noted, that, in accordance with the wording of claim 1, the error-detection and treatment devices are contained in the radiocommunication device).

The object of the claim 1 is thus not novel see Article 33 (2) PCT.

2.2 The same remarks as were made in section 2.1 above in relation to claim 1, are also applicable to the **independent claim 14**, since this claim has the same combination of features as claim 1 in the form of a method claim.

The object of the claim 14 is thus also not novel, see Article 33 (2) PCT.

2.3 It should also be noted that, even if the objection with

regard to the lack of novelty of claims 1 and 14 were to be called into question as a result of a slightly different interpretation of the wording in document **D1**, the object of these claims, as regards the disclosures of **D1** and the general specialist knowledge of the person skilled in the art in the area of radio networks and the corresponding reconfiguration methods, such as presented in document **D2** for example (see especially page 670), **does not enable any inventive step** to be recognized, see Article 33 (3) PCT. It should be pointed out especially, that in accordance with **D2** an error detection and an error treatment (i.e. an impetus for reconfiguration) is executed in the radio system external to the radiocommunication device, see page 670, last two lines of the section entitled "Rogue Terminal Detection"; and last two lines of the section entitled "Corrective Actions".

2.4 The **dependent claims 2 to 6** also do not contain **any** additional features, which in combination with the features of any other claim to which they relate back in each case, could lead to an object based on an **inventive step**, since the features of these claims are merely further developments, which are also known in principle from document **D1** (see especially page 404, right-hand column, section 3.2), document **D2** (see especially page 670, section entitled "Rogue Terminal Detection") **or** represent obvious embodiment details generally known to the person skilled in the art in the area of radio networks and corresponding reconfiguration methods.

Thus the dependent claims 2 to 6 also **do not** meet the requirements of Article 33 (3) PCT.

2.5 However the **independent claim 7** contains the additional feature that the control unit of the radiocommunication

device on occurrence of an error **using the error configuration information, establishes a communication connection to a computer providing error treatment.**

This combination of features is neither known from the available prior art nor is it approached by it.

The radiocommunication device described in document **D1** reconfigures the radio interface automatically in the event of an error. This internal error treatment makes provision for the incorrect normal operation configuration to be deactivated and for the radio interface to be reconfigured with the error-free old configuration (i.e. the error configuration). This error configuration thus becomes the normal operation configuration. Radio communication with other radiocommunication devices is continued as normal after the reconfiguration, without setting up communication with a computer providing error treatment.

The disadvantage of this radiocommunication device known from **D1** is that no cause is investigated for the error, since the radiocommunication device simply falls back to the old configuration in the event of an error. In addition in **D1** an error in an individual radiocommunication device causes a reconfiguration of all radiocommunication devices of the (ad-hoc) radio system.

The solution contained in claim 7 for remedying this disadvantage, namely that the error configuration is used to set up a communication connection with a computer which executes the error treatment (see above) enables individual error analysis and repair without adversely affecting the radio system.

As a result, the object of the claim 7 is to be seen as new

and inventive, Article 33 (2), (3) PCT. The object of the claim 7 is also industrially applicable, Article 33 (4) PCT.

2.6 The **dependent claims 8 to 13** contain advantageous developments of the object of claim 7 and thus also meet all requirements of Article 33 PCT.

3. Further remarks

3.1 The **independent claims 1, 7 and 14** are not entered in the **two-part form** in accordance with Rule 6.3 b) PCT. However division into two parts would appear to be useful in this case. As a result the features known in conjunction with each other from the prior art (**D1**) belong in the precharacterizing clause (Rule 6.3 b) i) PCT) and the other features in the characterizing part (Rule 6.3 b) ii) PCT), see also section 2.5.

3.2 The features of the claims have not been provided with **reference symbols** enclosed in brackets (Rule 6.2 b) PCT).

3.3 Contrary to the requirements of Rule 5.1 a) ii) PCT the description does not contain any introductory description relating to document D1, preferably in a form in which the inventive idea of the claimed facts are easy to understand.

It should be pointed out in particular that the difference from the prior art also stated on page 5, line 1 to 5, and page 8, line 31 to Page 7, line 13 of the description, the technical problem resulting from this, and its solution is not matched to the disclosure of document **D1**.